DOCKET NO.: 306352.01 / MSFT-2863 **PATENT**

Application No.: 10/750,205

Office Action Dated: October 4, 2007

REMARKS

Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1-4, 7-18, 20-22 will remain pending in this application. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter is added in the above amendments.

Claims 1-2, 9-10, 13, and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by United States Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0108271 (Hurmiz et al.). Claims 3-4, 7-8, 11-12, 14-18, and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Hurmiz et al. in view of United States Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0076036 ("Le"). Claim 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Hurmiz et al. in view of United States Patent 6,477,536 ("Pasumansky et al."). Further, claims 1, 13, and 22 are objected to since certain phrasing therein is alleged to be uncertain by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Interview Summary

Applicants' representative, Mr. Eiferman, and Examiner Angela Lie participated in a telephonic interview on November 28, 2007 to discuss the independent claims in relation to the cited references. Examiner Lie agreed to reevaluate the pending rejections in light of the arguments below.

Claim Objections

In light of the objection to independent claims 1, 13 and 22 for informalities, Applicants have amended such claims to better clarify the "data changes" therein. Applicants have not otherwise amended these claims since it is believed that the options provided by the persistence model are clearly differentiated as explained below.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1-2, 9-10, 13, and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by United States Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0108271 (Hurmiz et al.). Applicants respectfully traverse.

DOCKET NO.: 306352.01 / MSFT-2863

Application No.: 10/750,205

Office Action Dated: October 4, 2007

The present application discloses techniques for linking objects of a source datastore and a target datastore, as well as between two objects in a target datastore. The objects may, for example, be a dimension or a measure group. One aspect of the techniques is to specify a persistence model which controls how changes to the linked objects are handled. In particular, it will be noted at paragraphs 0054-0056 of the specification that the persistence property may be designated as "metadata," "data/fully persisted," or "not persisted."

The first option involves metadata of the linked object being retrieved and persisted. In this case, the metadata in the target datastore is not changed until the next time the object is processed or altered. It will be understood by those skilled in the art that the term "metadata" involves information about data. This is contrasted by the actual data of the object. The second persistence option is for the metadata and data of the object to be retrieved and persisted. This means that the metadata and data continue to exist in the target datastore and retain their values between runs of the program. Lastly, neither the metadata nor the data is persisted so that changes to the source object are fully dynamic. Accordingly, any change made to the source datastore is propagated to the linked object.

The Hurmiz et al. reference discloses a system for defining and collecting data in an information management system having a shared database. In particular, a database development and management tool is provided that enables a user to develop a customized interface to a database system. As seen in paragraph 0023 of Hurmiz et al., the database development and management controller 105 manages the interaction among a plurality of clients 101(a)-101(n) and the database management system 107, as well as the presentation of data to the clients and what data can be stored in database records 109(a)-109(n).

In light of the description of the Hurmiz et al. system, it is not seen where the database management system 107 and the database records 109(a)-109(n) contained therein equate to a source datastore and a target datastore as claimed. While data management system 107 controls the storing, retrieving, and updating of data and metadata in database records 109(a)-109(n) [paragraph 0026], there is nothing to teach or suggest linking at least one dimension between a source datastore and a target datastore.

In addition, Hurmiz et al. does not specify a persistence model for the "target datastore," let alone any options as to how data and metadata would be persisted in linked objects.

DOCKET NO.: 306352.01 / MSFT-2863 **PATENT**

Application No.: 10/750,205

Office Action Dated: October 4, 2007

The Applicants respectfully submit that the Hurmiz et al. reference does not anticipate the limitations in independent claims 1, 13 and 22. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 13, and 22 are patentable over the cited reference. Applicants further submit that claims 2 and 9-10 are patentable at least by reason of their dependency therefrom. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejections are respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 3-4, 7-8, 11-12, 14-18, and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Hurmiz et al. in view of United States Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0076036 ("Le"). Claim 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Hurmiz et al. in view of United States Patent 6,477,536 ("Pasumansky et al."). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Pursuant to the amendments of independent claims 1 and 13 and the arguments set forth above, Applicants submit that claims 3-4, 7-8, 11-12, 14-18, and 20-21 are patentable at least by reason of their dependency therefrom. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejections are respectfully requested.

DOCKET NO.: 306352.01 / MSFT-2863 **PATENT**

Application No.: 10/750,205

Office Action Dated: October 4, 2007

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application.

Date: March 4, 2008 /Kenneth R. Eiferman/

Kenneth R. Eiferman Registration No. 51,647

Woodcock Washburn LLP Cira Centre 2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891

Telephone: (215) 568-3100 Facsimile: (215) 568-3439